

**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP**

CATHERINE A. CONWAY (SBN 98366)

GREGORY W. KNOPP (SBN 237615)

MARK R. CURIEL (SBN 222749)

JEREMY F. BOLLINGER (SBN 240132)

cconway@akingump.com

gknopp@akingump.com

mcuriel@akingump.com

jbollinger@akingump.com

2029 Century Park East, Suite 2400

Los Angeles, California 90067

Telephone: 310-229-1000

Facsimile: 310-229-1001

Attorneys for Defendant Starbucks Corporation

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

BRITTNEY COOPER, an individual, on  
behalf of herself and all persons similarly  
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

STARBUCKS CORPORATION, a  
Washington Corporation; and DOES 1  
through 50, inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. CV 11-03268 PSG

**STIPULATION TO TRANSFER CASE TO  
THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER THEREON**

Date Action Filed: May 24, 2011

Date Action Removed: July 1, 2011

Case No. CV 11-03268 PSG

STIPULATION TO TRANSFER CASE TO THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA AND  
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER THEREON

101476703

1 Plaintiff Brittney Cooper ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Starbucks Corporation ("Defendant"), by  
2 and through their respective counsel, enter into a Stipulation to Transfer this Case to the Central  
3 District of California based upon the following facts:

4 1. On September 2, 2011, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, to  
5 transfer this action to the Central District of California. Defendant's motion was scheduled for hearing  
6 on October 11, 2011. Defendant contends that the case of *York v. Starbucks Corporation*, Case No. 08-  
7 CV-07919, which has been pending in the Central District since December 2, 2008, includes the same  
8 claims asserted by Plaintiff and the same putative class Plaintiff seeks to represent.

9 2. Having reviewed the motion, and to avoid unnecessary motion practice, Plaintiff has  
10 offered to stipulate to the transfer to the Central District. The parties agree that transfer is proper under  
11 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because this action could have been brought in the Central District, judicial  
12 economy favors a transfer, and a transfer would promote convenience for the parties and witnesses.

13 ///

1           THEREFORE, THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE that the October 11, 2011 hearing be  
2 taken off calendar, and this action be transferred to the Central District.

3           **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

4  
5 Dated: September 16, 2011

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP  
Catherine A. Conway  
Gregory W. Knopp  
Mark R. Curiel  
Jeremy F. Bollinger

6  
7  
8 By           /s/ Mark R. Curiel            
                                Mark R. Curiel  
                                Attorneys for Defendant  
9                               STARBUCKS CORPORATION  
10

11  
12 Dated: September 16, 2011

13 BLUMENTHAL, NORDREHAUG &  
BHOWMIK  
Norman B. Blumenthal  
Kyle R. Nordrehaug  
Aparajit Bhowmik

14  
15  
16 By           /s/ Kyle R. Nordrehaug            
                                Kyle R. Nordrehaug  
                                Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17                               BRITTNEY COOPER  
18  
19

20           **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21  
22 Dated: September 23, 2011

23 By           Paul S. Grewal            
                                Hon. Paul S. Grewal  
                                Magistrate Judge of the  
24                               United States District Court  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 2029 Century Park East, Suite 2400, Los Angeles, CA 90067. On September 16, 2011, I served the foregoing document(s) described as: **STIPULATION TO TRANSFER CASE TO THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA AND [PROPOSED] ORDER THEREON** on the interested party(ies) below, using the following means:

**All parties identified for Notice of Electronic Filing generated by the Court's CM/ECF system under the referenced case caption and number**

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION.** Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I caused the document(s) to be sent to the respective e-mail address(es) of the party(ies) as stated above. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed on September 16, 2011 at Los Angeles, California.

Rebecca McNew

[Print Name of Person Executing Proof]



[Signature]